UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Three Inhibiting Sins

By CLARENCE R. SKINNER

William Morris

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

Can We Make Progress?

SOME NEW BOOKS

By FREDERICK STARR

Voice

A Poem by ZONA GALE

VOLUME LXXXVIII NUMBER 4

Chicago, October 6, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Robbins, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 51
Three Inhibiting Sins.—Clarence R. Skinner 53

THE PULPIT—
The Labor Church in Canada.—W. Ivens 54

CONTRIBUTED—
Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature. XIII. William Morris.—George Willis Cooke 57
The Wisdom of the Peoples. V. The Proverbs of Italy. —James Waldo Fawcett 59

SELECTED—
On "Radicalism in the Churches."—*Tertullian Browne* . . . 59

THE STUDY TABLE—
Can We Make Progress? Some New Books.—Frederick Starr 61

POETRY—
Voice.—Zona Gale 51
Unrest.—*Don Marquis* 56
Night.—*Alice B. Spencer* 61

THE FIELD—
Abraham Lincoln Centre Friday Morning Forum.—Helen Rosenfels 63
Britain's Most Sacred Obligation.—Diana Agabeg Apcar 63

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

Vol. LXXXVIII. THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1921 Number 4

VOICE.

You in whose veins runs the fire of loving,
For people, for plants, for little animals,
For rocks and earth, stars and the elements,
You have a secret Voice, always singing.
It is never still. It runs with your haste
And idles in your silence. It is everywhere.
O you, for whom this passionate Voice sings
And will not be silent, think now of those
For whom no voice sounds. Of those who toil
Without the singing voice,
And live in a world which has not yet come through
Into your world.
O—can you not hear that the song your Voice is singing
Is the song which is to bring that world of theirs
Into the light which must light all men?

Why else do you imagine that this Voice is singing?
Why else do you imagine that the fire of love
Runs in your veins?

Zona Gale.

Our friend, *The Christian Register,* is troubled by our state of mind and manners. It wonders why we don't try "love" as our "major course." Bless your heart, dear brother, do you not know that Jenkin Lloyd Jones tried love in the days of the war when love was needed most and practiced least, and was rewarded, as he lay upon his death bed, by having Unity suppressed by the Government? Then our good neighbor goes on to declare that it does not like "a constant negative attitude to the world, fault finding with everything and everybody we may not agree with; scathing denunciation for people who are trying to do as honestly as we are, though mistaken; a certain exalted pride in our own opinion; a finality that says wisdom is coexistent with us; a lonely wilfulness to go our way, leaving the people bereft of our help—and depriving ourselves of their elemental inspiration and common sense." Woe is us! What a catalogue of sins! And how it pains us! for alas, like the man who could never read the symptoms of any disease (except housemaid's knee) without finding that he had them all, we have never been able to come face to face with moral frailty without feeling ourselves guilty. We envy the jaunty assurance of the *Register* that it is immune from all such failings, and wonder how it gets that way. Such virtue is high, we cannot attain unto it. We can only stand afar off, like the poor publican in the parable, and smite our breast, and cry, "God be merciful unto us, a sinner." And yet even such virtue of contrition is beyond us, so wicked are we. For in the day the word of the *Register* smote us, we happened to be rereading, for our soul's good, Emerson's "Self-Reliance," and we found ourselves pondering such sentences as these:

> Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind. . . . The only right is what is after my constitution, the only wrong what is against it. . . . I ought to go upright and vital, and speak the rude truth in all ways. . . . Truth is handsomer than the affectation of love. Your goodness must have some edge to it, else it is none. The doctrine of hatred must be preached as the counteraction of the doctrine of love when that pules and whines.

We fear we are hopeless, after all, dear brother. But even so, there still remains the obligation to serve the truth. Our ax may be an ill-tempered tool; but we have no other, and with it we must still "hew to the line, let the chips fall where they may."

When unemployment grips the country, as it does today, there are just two things that can be done. Relief can be offered to the victims, as is universally the practice in Europe; and the causes of the disaster can be studied, isolated and removed. A social ill, such as unemployment, in other words, calls for the same kind of action as a physical ill, such as typhoid fever. When a man falls sick of this disease, the first thing to do is to care for him and cure him; then the second thing is to investigate the causes of the disease, and see that these causes are abolished. So with the unemployed—they must first be relieved, then the causes of their helpless condition laid hold upon and conquered! This would seem to be elementary. And yet, in his opening address to the Conference on Unemployment, assembled in Washington on September 27th last, President Harding took particular pains to specify that it was just these two things which must *not* be done in the present crisis.

> "I would have little enthusiasm," he said to the conferees, "for any proposed relief which seeks either palliation or tonic from the public treasury." And secondly, "It is fair to say that you are not asked to solve the long controverted problems of our social system."

In addition to these two gems of counsel, the President had nothing to say but to praise the present state of the Nation. Pollyanna herself was never more cheerful:

> "Fundamentally sound, financially strong, industrially unimpaired, commercially consistent (what does that mean?) and politically unafraid," he said, "there ought to be work for everybody in the United States who chooses to work."

This is a delightful truth, but where does it "get" us. We have no doubt we are a low-down, mean-spirited, carping critic of men better than ourselves. All right, let it go at that! But we have to rise up all the same and ask: If there is nothing the matter, and if nothing is to be done about it, why, Oh why, was the Conference on Unemployment called and thus solemnly addressed by the Chief Magistrate of the Republic?

The New York *World* has achieved courageous, efficient and public-spirited feat of journalistic enterprise in its now famous exposé of the Ku Klux Klan. This piece of work ought to put it first in line for the Pulitzer Prize for 1921. Thanks to the *World* we now know that the Klan is an organization based on bigotry and intolerance, a teacher of hate and a practitioner of violence, and incidentally a highly-profitable business for those in charge of its affairs. For all its infamy, however, we still find it impossible to take the K. K. K. seriously or to worry about its permanent influence in American life. Nothing that the *World* has taught us about the society is so conspicuous as its absurdity. What with its Kleagles, Terrors, Titans, Cyclops, and Goblins—the flamboyant proclamations of its Imperial Wizard dated from the Aulic of the Invisible Empire in Atlanta—the rituals and emblems which would make a college sophomore perish from hilarity—this thing is simply too ridiculous to win the support or stir the awe of men. The American people may be ignorant, superstitious, easily imposed upon, a "boobocracy," as Brother Menken is fond of calling them. But nobody has ever attempted to deny that they have a sense of humor; and if this latest edition of the Ku Klux does not stir mightily the latent risibilities in the bosom of the great American public we shall be indeed surprised. It is for this reason that we deprecate the suggestion that the Government should investigate and suppress the Imperial Wizard and his cohorts. Suppression under any circumstances is dangerous business, and in this case is certainly not necessary. The *World* is doing the one thing that can end the business most effectively—that is telling the story and letting the people judge for themselves. The "inextinguishable laughter" that must follow upon any recitation of the facts, has already begun, and will soon be sweeping the nation like a tornado. When a Ku Kluxer sees that he is not a Terror nor a Titan at all, but just a common, every-day, garden variety of fool, he will disappear fast enough.

Somebody asks us why we have said nothing during recent months about the Irish situation. One reason is that shifts and changes have come so fast, that no editorial comment written in New York for publication in Chicago more than a week later, could hope to be up to date. This is one of the disadvantages of editing a paper at a distance of a thousand miles! Another reason is that, rightly or wrongly, we have felt from the beginning that there could be only one possible outcome of the situation, and that this outcome could best be discussed when it appeared. In the meantime, however, if our readers are interested, we are willing to make confession of some of the feelings that have been stirring in our breast during the summer. One is amusement that Irishmen, denounced for two whole years as murderers, whose blood-stained hands could be clasped by no man who considered himself a gentleman, should suddenly be considered good enough to be received in intimate counsel, and be given control of Ireland on a Dominion basis. Another is amazement that Americans long accustomed to reverence Robert Bruce, William Tell. Washington, Kossuth, Garibaldi, Mazzini, as uncompromising champions of liberty, should denounce De Valera for serving steadfastly the same cause in the same way. Still another is disgust that people insistent that Ireland shall practice a little common sense, never ask that England and Ulster shall do the same. And then, in quiet moments, when all was still about us, and memories came creeping into our mind, we have found ourselves thinking of that bitter boast made months ago in the House of Commons by Lloyd George: "We have the murderers by the throats." Talking about "murderers," with England's record being inscribed daily in red upon the pages of Irish history, was venturesome business. But then, Mr. Lloyd George has never been accused of timidity! But what did he mean by that phrase about having them "by the throats"? Perhaps the Premier will tell us in the seclusion of that retirement which patient gods are preparing for his shame.

Alas, the poor school children! We read that the American Federation of Labor is greatly concerned because the public schools are not presenting to boys and girls the principles and ideals of the modern labor movement, and is to see to it that text-books, etc., are so prepared that this omission may be effectively supplied. This bulletin follows hard upon the proclamation of the American Legion that it intended to see to it that nothing but 100 per cent patriotism is taught in the schools, and to oust every teacher who does not meet exacting tests of true Americanism. Back of this again are the activities of organizations like the National Security League; the efforts of Anglophiles to eliminate from school histories the unfortunate episodes of the American Revolution and the War of 1812; legislation like the notorious Lusk Bill in New York, binding teachers with an oath of loyalty; the clownish capers of city school boards, like that in New York City, proscribing unorthodox lecturers, prescribing courses of study teaching children what they shall think in political and economic subjects, etc. It is a long time since the public schools were regarded as existing for purposes of *education*. They have now become simply instruments of propaganda, to be captured and used by any organization strong enough at the moment to effect its nefarious purposes. It looks as though the school were going the same way to perdition as the press. Alas for the day when our guardians of liberty become mere hireling prostitutes!

A new type of "conscientious objector" has appeared. His habitat is Holland; and there are six hundred of him in jail in that country, according to recent reports. This conscientious objector is a logical being who extends to peace times the principles of war times. Thus in Holland he is refusing to pay taxes for the maintenance of army and navy. It seems that "preparedness" there amounts to 51 per cent of the whole body of taxation; and so far six hundred citizens have been sent to prison for refusal to pay this proportion of their taxes. Recently Mr. De Ligt, President of the International Anti-Militarist Bureau, was arrested for commending to his countrymen this very effective method of expressing pacifist views. As we read of these doings in Holland, we are reminded of stories about Ship Money in England and Stamp Taxes in America. Nay, our mind goes farther back to the early days of Christian history, when followers of the lowly Nazarene refused to lay their pinch of salt on the altars dedicated to the worship of the Roman emperors. To refuse to obey the common will, is a most serious step to take, especially in a democracy. It is surely not to be resorted to except as a last measure of protest. But there have come times in the past when there was nothing else to do, if mankind was to live, and another such time may well be with us now in this matter of war and preparedness for war. Certainly if it is proper to refuse to take up arms against the enemy when hostilities have been declared, it is proper to refuse to pay for the making of these arms *before* hostilities have been declared. During the World War, we regarded the conscientious objectors' movement as the one ray of light on a black horizon. We regard this extension of the movement to peace times as a brightening of this light unto what, in God's good time, may be at last "the perfect day."

Three Inhibiting Sins

In order to have world peace and world progress, there must be world consciousness; or, if this phrase seems too mystical, let us say, a habit of thinking in terms of the universal human. By this time all thoughtful men must be convinced that this attitude of inclusiveness must be essential to the rehabilitation of the social order. Wells in the "Outline" and in recent articles drives this fact home. Norman Angell in his "Fruits of Victory" emphasizes the need. Men of vision see that it is the fundamental on which the superstructure of world organization and disarmament must rest. It is the radical force.

How to get it is the question to which men of constructive purpose are setting their minds and wills.

There are three barriers standing across the path which leads to world consciousness; three sins which inhibit world unity. The word sin is here used in the old Greek sense of "missing the mark." Salvation lies in confession and repentance. When we realize that these established attitudes prevent us from achieving the best life, half the struggle is won.

First, and most obviously, nationalism. It misses the goal because it produces the provincial rather than the world mind. It fastens attention upon the segment rather than upon the perfect round. It glorifies the partial, and produces a cult of dangerous, narrow emotionalism.

It gives false perspectives to everything. It distorts the importance of race, language, trade, possession, art, literature. It fills its devotees with a sense of superiority which they do not possess. It makes what is a virtue in themselves intolerable in others.

It causes unnatural hate and suspicion. Imperialism thus feeds upon it and grows insolently great.

The quality of mind begotten by nationalism is thus the very stuff of which wars are made. If we are to attain peace we must recognize this fact and begin a process of re-education everywhere.

The second is capitalism, which is a form of economic partialism. It is a sin in the sense that men do not attain their best selves under its dominion. They do not achieve relations of mutual trustfulness. In capitalism we have the psychology of exclusiveness. Men are set over against each other in opposing classes, a fact which arouses suspicion and distorts sympathy. Its divisiveness makes a man somewhat less than human; it puts him in a category. It thus misses the goal of unity.

Capitalism places a premium upon cunning, and thus fosters the contentious mind. It makes captains not comrades of the strong. Its emphasis upon acquisitiveness produces envy and bitterness. It thus introduces the elements of which war is made. It fails to fully utilize the more generous, democratic and co-operative impulses of which peace is made.

How can we produce a world consciousness if we do not work together and live together along the common ways of toil? Can we hope to sit together in Parliaments if we cannot sit together in the shop? If the community is rent by industrial strife how can the world dwell in peace? If war lives in the mind of the worker, will it die in the mind of the citizen?

Capitalism is probably not guilty of the crude bloodthirst which the bitter opponent attributes to it. Its influence upon war is far more subtle than that. It is only when we come to recognize the psychology of divisiveness and disaggregation which inhere in capitalism, that we shall be able to see the connection. Having seen, we can go forward to the co-operative economic commonwealth.

Sectarianism, in its broadest sense, is an inhibitory sin against the holy spirit of world unity and peace. At the heart of world consciousness is a world religion—a spiritual expansion of the individual. But sectarianism means a cutting off. A sectarian is an

adherent of a partial truth. He tries to compress a great hope or a growing truth into a little creed.

Sect binds minds as China binds feet. It keeps them infantile and useless. Churches are founded on theological speculation and they keep their adherents busy defending and rationalizing their speculation. This prevents the large and free mind.

Sectarianism cannot give world consciousness because it is not universal, except in so far as it claims for itself universal acceptability (the worst form of egotistical partialism). It wants the world one, but that one is to be according to its pattern. Men are Christian, Jew, Mohammedan, Episcopal, Presbyterian, what not. But if the Jew, Catholic and Protesant do not form the habit of thinking of themselves in mutually inclusive terms, can there be any spiritual unity? If each is a chosen people—a custodian of the true revelation—there is a thwarting of right vision which makes for spiritual myopia. If sectarianism cannot produce world consciousness in the realm of ethical idealism, how can it claim to produce it in politics and economics?

The world needs some inward sustaining, some compelling discipline and habit of mind which will help it rise above the strain of jealousy and fear of war. A world religion, synthetic and tolerant, would inspire such greatness. It is just at this point where the movement toward world consciousness should begin. But sectarian religion has that genius of divisiveness and bigotry within it which inhibits the coming of the great spiritual enlargement.

The recognition that sectarianism is not merely an economic waste, or a form of ecclesiastical inefficiency, but that it is a sin, a barrier against the spirit of the whole, will help toward the attainment of a religion of world unity.

Thus there are three sins (at least) which cause a wrong mental attitude to persist in the presence of a world crisis. The psychoanalyst says that the way to overcome evil is to face reality. When we look at a fact fearlessly, reconstruction begins. To pride ourselves upon these sins and call them virtues is hypocrisy, and hypocrisy leads to spiritual bankruptcy. To face these facts and to know that they are sins, the very stuff of which divisiveness and contention are made, is to set our faces toward health and peace.

These habits of mind—nationalism, capitalism, sectarianism, are acquired characteristics. They are not born in the germ plasm and they need not be passed on from generation to generation. They were once radical departures from the old. The world can make another radical departure from its present old if it will. It can re-orient itself and grow from nationalism to internationalism, from capitalism to economic co-operation, from sectarianism to world religion. This is the needed release. CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

THE PULPIT

The Labor Church in Canada

By W. IVENS, M.A., B.D., M.L.A.

When James Russell Lowell wrote those immortal words, "New times demand new measures and new men," because, "The world advances," he might well have added that "New times demand new institutions," to express the new interpretations of the times. It was freely predicted during the war that there would have to be a new religion to meet the new demands. It is upon the shores of the New World that the "new religious movement" has made its appearance. Cynics will probably say that it is nothing new to have a new religion in America.

Probably, no greater antithesis appears in history than religion as interpreted by, say, the Roman Catholic Church, and as interpreted by the Canadian Labor Church movement. The former is based on authority, and supernaturalism, mysticism, and ritual, and obedience, are its inner essence. The latter knows no authority other than that of its own members. It says that religion is a thing for life, not death; for men, and not for angels; for time, and not for eternity. It accepts nothing that does not appeal to, and convince, the reason.

The Roman Church is strongly anti-socialistic, and makes much of the property instinct. The Labor Church says that the new interpretation of life must be social as opposed to individualistic, and that the ideal to be attained is not property, but rather, "from each according to his ability, and to each according to his need." Needless to say, therefore, it has made both warm supporters and bitter opponents.

Nineteen hundred years ago "a new religion" came to birth. Its founder was accused of "perverting the nation," and of "stirring up the people." His followers were "turning the world upside down." The "Crown" proved its case—supported by the religious leaders of the day—and Jesus Christ was crucified. It is a truism to say that the condemners are to-day the condemned, and that the crucified has been justified. Yet, when in 1918 the Labor Church was started in Canada, it was opposed by the orthodox religious leaders and by the State, and its leader was condemned and sentenced.

For several years before the war started the writer of this article was an avowed Pacifist. He was then a minister of the Methodist Church of Canada. When the war came he stood by his pacifist principles and in the year 1918 found himself expelled from the Methodist Church. Feeling still the "call" to preach the gospel of social salvation, he rented the Labor Temple and started what has now become the "Winnipeg Labor Church" movement. Soon the Secret Police were in attendance at the Church services, and the government was vigorously opposing the "Western Labor News," of which he had been made editor. The end of that story was the "Dungeon Cell" for the founder of the new church.

We would forget it if we could; but it is hard to forget that "indictment." How terrible it reads! It sets forth that,

> William Ivens . . . did unlawfully conspire, confederate and agree, ... with other persons . . . . to carry into effect a seditious intention; to wit: to bring into hatred and contempt and to excite disaffection against the government laws and

constitution of Canada . . . . to promote feelings of hostility and ill-will between different classes of such subjects.....etc.

Then there was added during the trial the further particulars that he did,

. . . conspire to destroy all faith in God, and also to destroy the sanctity of marriage and the family.

The prosecuting attorney said in part,

. . . . I maintain that this so-called Labor Church is merely a camouflage for the preaching of sedition and for fanning the flames of unrest. . . . . Their doctrines intend to make you forget all you ever were taught at your mother's knee. Their aim is to remove the word "duty" from the dictionary, and to substitute pleasure and vice. The whole vile doctrine preaches duty to class first. Self before country.

No wonder that a jury of farmers brought in a verdict of "guilty on all seven counts." Yet there is another and a better side. The membership card paints quite a different picture:

I am willing to support an independent and creedless church, based on the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man. Its aim shall be the establishment of justice and righteousness on earth among men and nations.

Not so terrible after all is it? Why then the conviction? Thereby hangs a tale. A sordid tale, but, nevertheless, a tale that will very probably be told for many a year. The year behind prison bars, and the election to Parliament of the founder of the church while still incarcerated in the common jail, will not soon be forgotten.

The Winnipeg General Strikes of May-June, 1919, are still fresh in the minds of Canadians and Americans. That was the hour of crisis for the New Church movement. Would it stand true in that great hour of strain? It stood true. It met the need. It underwent its baptism.

The strike was on. The churches were opposed to the strikers, and, in some instances opened the doors of their churches as recruiting offices for a militia to shoot down the workers. We will let Mr. J. S. Woodsworth, B.A., tell the story for us. He had just arrived in the city from Vancouver. He says:

I remember my first Labor Church meeting. It was the third week of the strike. The vast congregation, estimated at 10,000, filled Victoria Park. For nearly two hours I talked—could not but talk. Dixon talked, Canon Scott talked, Robinson talked, Ivens talked. The people "stood it" in a double sense of the term, and then gave a collection of $1,500.00 for the relief of the girls on strike. The police reported us as "Bolshevist Spellbinders" and "dangerous crowds of illiterate foreigners." Some of us thought we felt the spirit of a great revival.

The women and children sat on the dry grass. The men, many of them wearing returned soldier's buttons, stood in a large outer circle. The chairman was one of the few business men who had shewn sympathy with the strikers.

Faith of our Fathers, living still
In spite of dungeon fire and sword.

The old hymn rang out with a new meaning to those who, during the preceding fortnight, had been behind the bars or shot at by the soldiery, or otherwise deprived of the rights of free citizens.

Our Fathers, chained in prisons dark,
Were still in heart and conscience free . . . .
Faith of our Fathers, Holy Faith,
We will be true to thee till death.

Then a Scotch working man led in prayer. Not a conventional prayer by any means, though full of conventional phrases. He prayed for the profiteers, that God's grace might be vouchsafed to them that they might see the error of their ways; and that we might have courage to stand by our brothers.

The preacher, just out of jail, was greeted with applause. He pleaded for fair treatment for "the strangers within our gates," his fellow prisoners who had *not* been allowed out on bail. He urged, "Seek ye first God's Kingdom—a kingdom of love and justice—other things—jobs and wages—will be added."

Then the closing hymn; Lowell's words of cheer:

Though the cause of evil prosper,
Yet 'tis truth alone is strong
Though her portion be the scaffold,
And upon the throne be wrong,—
Yet that scaffold sways the future,
And, behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God amid the shadow
Keeping watch above his own.

That was, and is, the spirit of the Labor Church. It was a spontaneous movement of the people. It was a protest against organized Christianity as they saw it at that moment. It was a protest against the combined force of Church, State, and the Captains of Industry. It was a revolt against denominationalism and formality, and commercialism, in the churches. It was a revolt against Imperialism in nationality and religion. The people were hungry for a religion that had a social content, and for a spiritual food that would nourish them here rather than hereafter.

Fellowship had a new meaning for those men and women in that hour. Women gave up their summer holidays so that they could sustain their striking sisters. Small storekeepers gave of their small hoardings that none might go hungry. The Labor Church emptied its coffers until not a dollar was left in its treasury. Here was a new thing under the sun. Brotherhood had a meaning. There were no foreigners.

At length there dawns the glorious day
By prophets long foretold,
At length the chorus clearer grows,
That shepherds heard of old;
The day of growing brotherhood
Breaks on our eager eyes,
And human hatreds flee before
The radiant Eastern skies.

It was a wonderful six weeks. Men and women stood shoulder to shoulder unflinchingly in spite of the pinch of hunger in order that they might win "A Living Wage," and "The Right to Organize."

The employers had to do something, so they lined the Government up against the workers. The Leader of the Labor Church was editor of "The Strike Bulletin." The movement must be crushed. The charge of seditious conspiracy was laid, and a dozen men arrested. Mr. Ivens was one of the number.

The "radicals" had been for months before the strike strongly opposed to the Labor Church. To them, "Religion is the opium of the people." The Labor Church *might* win back the workers to religion, and religion to them meant organized religion as they had seen it. This, however, was a small matter to the "Crown." Every man arrested was made responsible for everything said and written by every other person arrested, and for every piece of literature found in a raid carried on throughout the whole Dominion. The conviction was a matter of course. The sentences varied from one to two years imprisonment.

The Old Book says, "Oh Death where is thy sting." This will soon have to be changed to "Oh Jail where is thy victory." Why? Well, on Sunday the people by the thousands flocked to the Labor Church, and on Tuesday—visiting day at the jail—they marched there week after week, until the prison seemed like the reception room of an ambassador.

The leaders were convicted, but they were not condemned. This was demonstrated in a spectacular manner in June, 1920, when four of the men accused,

and *three of the men then actually in prison, were elected to the Provincial Legislature* by large majorities.

They stood side by side in the dock a year ago. They chafed side by side in prison cells for a year. Now side by side these same men have taken their seats in the Halls of the Legislature.

We have said that the Labor Church believes in a spiritual interpretation of life. That it believes in a continually developing religion, and that its aim is to establish equity on earth. We must add that it welcomes to its ranks all persons irrespective of creed, class, or race. It realizes that only by education can intelligent progress be made, and believes that the association of men and women will inspire all to higher thoughts and nobler aspirations. It does not believe that it can alone solve all the ills of humanity, but sees clearly that it is but part of a great world-wide movement for human betterment. It, therefore, seeks to co-operate with all other movements having a similar aim.

The Labor Church has no "Constitution." It works out its destiny step by step. Its membership is its managing body. There are at present seven branches in Winnipeg, and other churches in other Canadian cities. Each local branch elects three delegates to the Central Committee. This meets weekly at 530 Main St., Winnipeg, and the paid Secretary keeps the record.

This body chooses the speakers for each branch, pays all bills common to the movement, and decides all questions that affect the movement as a whole. Women and men work together as speakers and members of the managing board.

Each branch church decides absolutely its own way of working; secures its own place of meeting, and pays all local expenses. The result is that no two branches are alike. Some branches are known as "Radical," while other branches are designated as decidedly "orthodox." In this way it is found that persons of different temperament can find a branch that suits them.

The plan of the movement is to expand into every city in Canada, and to link itself finally with the progressive religious movements in the United States and overseas. This is admittedly a large order, but then, those responsible for the success of this movement realize that time is eternal, and they are not looking for a "Redeemer" to come and bring the "millennium." They believe that the emancipation of the people will be a long, long process and that it is liable to take a very long time. Hence they are not averse to making long plans.

No one would deny that there is a very large amount of "idealism" in the movement. The hymns sung and the addresses delivered all tell the same tale. It is true that some speakers advocate "Marxianism," and that others advocate "Reformism," and that still others urge "Single Tax," or "Hour for Hour Pay," and some give a "Good old fashioned gospel talk," yet through it all there runs the idealist strain.

The difference between this church and others is that it deals with the present rather than the future; with the reasoned rather than with the mystical; with men rather than with spirits; with facts of every day life rather than with the speculations of eternity; and it sees clearly that man must work out his own destiny.

Like the mists of early morning
  Fade before the golden sun,
When the glad new day is dawning,
  And the stars their course have run;
So shall pass the night of error,
  Superstition, sordid strife;
Life's new day, diviner, fairer,
  Promise gives of fuller life.

In an hour when empires are crumbling and thrones are tottering to their fall; in an hour when large sections of the world are engulfed in chaos and strife; in an hour when the difference between men and nations is over emphasized, it is cheering to find one movement in which there still is hope and purpose and a desire for unity and equity.

The knell has been sounded for individualism in all its branches. The hour has struck for a new religious vision. If the Labor Church finds that vision and follows the grail, it has before it a mighty future.

"The time is ripe and rotten ripe for change,
Then let it come....."

UNREST.

A fierce unrest seethes at the core
  Of all existing things:
It was the eager wish to soar
  That gave the gods their wings.

From what flat wastes of cosmic slime,
  And stung by what quick fire,
Sunward the restless races climb!—
  Men risen out of mire!

There throbs through all the worlds that are
  This heart-beat hot and strong,
And shaken system, star by star,
  Awake and glow in song.

But for the urge of this unrest
  These joyous spheres are mute;
But for the rebel in his breast
  Had man remained a brute.

When baffled lips demanded speech,
  Speech trembled into birth—
(One day the lyric word shall reach
  From earth to laughing earth.)—

When man's dim eyes demanded light,
  The light he sought was born—
His wish, a Titan, scaled the height
  And flung him back the morn!

From deed to dream, from dream to deed,
  From daring hope to hope,
The restless wish, the instant need,
  Still lashed him up the slope!

. . . .

I sing no governed firmament,
  Cold, ordered, regular—
I sing the stinging discontent
  That leaps from star to star!

—*Don Marquis.*

In my belief the best hope for lasting peace, the chief promise of security for the rights and freedom of little countries, the most reasonable guarantee of international justice and general humanity, lies in the gradual growth of democracy, of rule by consent of the governed. When Europe is all democratic, and its civilization on one plane, instead of as now on two —then and then only we shall begin to draw the breath of real assurance.—*Galsworthy.*

CONTRIBUTED

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature

XIII.

WILLIAM MORRIS.

William Morris, 1834-1896, was as devoted to art as was Wagner and Ruskin; but his interest in it took a far wider range than did theirs. He discovered, as they did, however, that modern industrial and commercial conditions were not favorable to art; and that their effect was to cripple art in many directions. The result with him, as with them, was to cause him to revolt against these conditions, and to seek for what would be artistically more advantageous. If he did not seek the same form of social regeneration that they did, it was because his environment was other than theirs, and because social theory had progressed beyond that stage which had been reached in their time. Morris was influenced by Ruskin as Ruskin had been influenced by Carlyle, and progressed to a more definite conception of what art demanded in order that it might prosper. The aristocratic socialism of Ruskin did not please Morris, who was thoroughly a democrat, both in theory and in practice.

A. Hamilton Thompson, in the "Cambridge History of English Literature," says of Morris, that "his love of the beautiful work of the past, material and imaginative, stood for him in the place of religious fervor, and his whole strength of purpose was dedicated to the reconstruction of modern life, upon conditions similar to those under which such work, impossible in an age of mere competition for money, was produced." Bruce Glasier sees in William Morris one of the greatest men of genius this or any other land has ever known. "In abundance of creative energy and fullness of skill in arts and letters it is doubtful if he has ever been excelled." Compton-Rickett says of Morris, that "on one side he was an artist throughout, with an artist's tastes, his eclecticism, his wholehearted devotion to the spirit of beauty; a dreamer of dreams; one who lived in a world of his own fashioning. On the other side, he was a bluff, direct, downright man interested in concrete realities; a man of shrewd common sense and practical sagacity."

In his biography of Morris, J. W. Mackail describes him as having "something of the quality of an overwhelming natural force; like the north wind, it braced and buffetted in almost equal measure. He had the incessant restlessness of a wild animal. Even at work or at meals he could not sit still for long. This restless movement was a necessity to him as a means of working off his great bodily strength and superabundant vitality." H. M. Hyndman, when he first came into intimate contact with Morris, remarks that he was at the height of his reputation. "He had already succeeded in everything he had attempted. Not only was he a distinguished man of letters, an artist, a craftsman, a designer, a decorator, with a thorough knowledge of architecture and all connected therewith; but in addition to, and in spite of, all these remarkable capacities embodied in one person he had actually built up a successful business when his own considerable fortune ran short. Morris was a university man who had achieved for himself a European fame, and was universally regarded as one of the few living Englishmen who would be accorded willingly a leading position among the most celebrated men of his time."

In the later Victorian age Morris held high rank as a poet, his poems based on Greek and Teutonic legends placing him by the side of Tennyson, Browning, and Swinburne. If he were, as he called himself, the singer of an idle day, he was not the less the interpreter of his own age to those who most needed encouragement and incentive. Nor was his rank as a romancer, interpreter of the old communal life of the early middle ages, inferior to that as a poet. Repeating the old tales to his own time, and in a manner to make them live again, he was also able to bring to his own time brave thoughts and noble hopes. He sang not only of the past, but he sought to give power and clear vision to the age which is before us. Perhaps it was because he realized in imagination that which the past had been to men, that he was able to forecast what the new time might be to those who sought a wider and more invigorating day to come.

In his early poetry, such as "The Defence of Guenevere," 1858; "The Life and Death of Jason," 1867; "The Earthly Paradise," 1868; "The Story of Sigurd," 1877, Morris was largely influenced by the Pre-Raphaelite school of poetry and painting. At this time he was enamored of the past, and what he conceived to be its more romantic and artistic phases of human life. It was when Morris came to think that the present industrial and economic conditions are not friendly to poetry and art that he wrote in quite another spirit. In this later period he produced three distinctly modern books of poetry. These were his "Chants for Socialists," 1885; "The Pilgrims of Hope," 1886; and "Poems by the Way," 1891. In these books he was more lyrical, modern and optimistic.

After he had reached midde age Morris was strongly drawn to modern socialism and communism. In "The Dream of John Ball," 1888, Morris expressed the sentiment which had taken possession of him and determined all his later career. He put into the mouth of John Ball these words, which were expressive of his own deepest faith: "Fellowship is heaven, and lack of fellowship is hell; fellowship is life, and lack of fellowship is death; and the deeds that ye do upon the earth, it is for fellowship's sake that ye do them, and the life that is in it, that shall live on and on forever, and each one of you part of it." It was this sentiment which led Morris to the writing of those romances in which he interpreted the tribal and mediæval social conditions of northern Europe in the far past. These included "The House of the Wolfings" and all the "Kindreds of the Mark," 1888; "The Roots of the Mountains," 1890; "The Story of the Glittering Plain," 1891; "The Wood Beyond the World," 1894; "The Well as the World's End," 1894; "The Water of the Wondrous Isles," 1897; and "The Sundering Flood," 1899. In these romances Morris was a poet imagining the past, dreaming of what the life of men had once been, and how they had managed to live in ages less beset by competition and struggle than our own.

When Morris reached the age of forty-four he became interested in modern social problems, and it was four years later that he became fascinated by Socialism. Fascinated is not too strong a word to use in regard to the interest which Morris took in Socialism when he once grasped its significance for him in connection

with art and poetry. It gave him new life, an enlarged vision of the world, and larger incentives to all his labors. His biographer says that he was naturally a Socialist, and that he was so long before he came to any active knowledge of the Socialist movement. "I have long known or felt," said Morris in 1881, "that society in spite of its modern smoothness was founded on injustice and kept together by cowardice and tyranny; but the hope in me has been that matters would mend gradually, till the last struggle, which must needs be mingled with violence and madness, would be so short as scarcely to count."

When the situation did not mend, Morris joined the Social Democratic Federation, in January, 1883. It seemed to him that art, poetry, human progress, all that is promising in modern life, is in some way connected with the advance of modern Socialism. Any criticism he met with, any detriment to his social and business interests, he willingly accepted for the sake of the cause. In one of his lectures of this period he asked: "How can we of the middle class, we the capitalists and our hangers-on, help? By renouncing our class, and on all occasions when antagonism rises between the classes, casting in our lot with the victims, those who are condemned at the best to lack of education, refinement, leisure, pleasure and renown; and at the worst, to a life lower than that of the most brutal of savages. There is no other way."

With this faith in him Morris became an active worker in behalf of Socialism. He gave much of his time to lecturing in behalf of Socialism, in halls and on the soap box in every part of the country, wherever opportunity offered, to little companies and great ones, on street corners and in academic circles, to university students and to hard-handed workers. Many of these lectures have been published, and all are worth reading for their literary force, their simplicity of statement, and their wide comprehension of the relations of the toilers to all forms of art and the joy of life. He turned away from no opportunity to speak for Socialism, which seemed to him the very breath of life, for the reason that it promised a brighter future for mankind, a life of joy for the toiler in his work, and a new fresh day for art and poetry. Morris edited for some years *The Commonweal,* the Socialist weekly journal published in London. He set forth his utopian conception of the future of society in "News from Nowhere." He joined with H. M. Hyndman in defining the principles of Socialism, and with Belford Bax in producing a book on the growth and outcome of Socialism.

Morris has been described as a Socialist, and properly so. He worked with the Socialists in London and throughout Great Britain; and he defined himself as of that social faith. At the same time, he was a Socialist with a difference. He was a man of too original a cast of mind, too uncompromisingly individualistic, to accept without qualification the teachings of Karl Marx or any other. He was a Socialist who was a poet and an artist. At the same time he was a craftsman, a publisher of artistic books, a decorator of houses, a designer of artistic furniture; in a word, a lover of the beautiful in all its forms. He was also an inventor and creator of beautiful objects of many kinds.

What Morris really believed in was not a great democratic state, a state in which the workers should have full recognition of their basic place in society. What he described through the words of John Ball, and in his utopian romance, was in reality Communism, as we know it and define it today. For him Socialism meant a commune or township, a limited territory, given over to happy and joyous workers, who shared together in their toil, in their songs, and in their glad merry-making. He may have conceived of many such communes, all united into a "Great State"; but what he really cared for, and what he described, was the social group bound together by common interests and common labors. Perhaps it was because he did not have the gift for working out the broader conception, and of defining a vast commonwealth of many interrelated and antagonistic interests. Perhaps, too, it was because he was a poet and an artist that he could not work out for himself the complications and crisscrossing interests of a state that had empire proportions.

What Morris cared for, and with a passionate intensity, was that the workers should find life no longer a mere drudgery, but a joy in happy labor that should be for the real benefit of their kind. No one has pleaded more zealously, and more convincingly, for this union of toil and joy in the place of work and drudgery. He felt the situation of the workers keenly and appreciatively, partly because he joined in all kinds of labor himself, and partly because he could imaginatively put himself in the place of the working drudge. Few men have ever shown this capacity to understand what hard work is to the toiler who sees nothing beyond his work, in the degree in which it was comprehended by Morris. Not only did Morris understand what drudgery is, the burden, the sorrow, and the curse of it; but he could feel it as if he were the worker himself. In this Morris was a Socialist who saw beyond the questions of economic interest, class struggle, and surplus value to the worker himself. He not only sympathized with the worker, appreciated his life of unrelieved drudgery; but desired for him that there might be brought to him relief of such a nature as to give him joy of his toil. Morris felt that work should have in it an element of beauty, of delight in the work done, and of warm personal interest in the nature of the work to be accomplished. He was certain the worker was not to blame for his hard hands, his dull brain, and his irksome tasks; that it was not his heredity which was mostly at fault. He saw that it was also his environment, the very drudgery itself when it was unrelieved, that made the stupid mind and the slow brain. Work might be made to yield far different results, Morris was convinced; and it was this conviction of his which made him a Socialist.

It is true that in his later years Morris lost some of his interest in Socialism, at least, that he no longer gave the cause such devoted service as he had in the first years of his enthusiasm. There is no reason for supposing that Morris ever ceased to be a convinced Socialist or that he desired to withdraw from his faith in what Socialism represented. Partly it was that he found other interests, and partly that his strength had begun to wane. He lived so intensely, gave himself to his labors with such completeness of devotion, that he could not keep the old pace to the end. He wore himself out by the very intensity of his life. All the time, however, whatever the interest that was uppermost with him, he loved his fellowmen, and he gave

his life with utmost loyalty to seeking to promote their happiness, their appreciation of beauty, and their living fellowship in each other.

GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

The Wisdom of the Peoples

V.

THE PROVERBS OF ITALY.

Proverbs bear age, and he who would do well may view himself in them as in a looking glass.

The best throw of the dice is never to play at them.

Speak well of your friend, of your enemy neither well nor ill.

No man's head aches while he comforts another.

Everyone hath enough to do to govern himself well.

Bold and shameless men are masters of half the world.

No sooner is a law made than an evasion of it is discovered also.

A bad agreement is better than a good lawsuit.

He who would have no trouble in this world must not be born in it.

Keep company with good men and you will increase their number.

A courtier is a slave in golden chains.

He who spins hath one shirt, he who spins not hath two.

If young men had wit and old men strength everything might be well done.

When war begins, hell opens.

A book whose sale is forbidden all men rush to see and prohibition turns one reader into three.

A bad book is the worst of thieves.

The best revenge is to prevent injury.

Men's sins and debts are always more than they think them to be.

A good lawyer does not go to law himself.

The wise discourses of a poor man go for nothing.

To an unjust government a martyr is more dangerous than a rebel.

Reason governs the wise man, but the cudgel a fool.

Short is the road that leads from fear to hate.

Falsehood has beauty if it works for good.

He conquers who endures.

To him who has no money all things are lacking.

An honest man hath twice as much brains as he needs, a knave not half enough.

Who threatens most is he who most doth fear.

He who has the courage to laugh is almost as much master of the world as he who is ready to die.

Not to believe the truth is the worst of all ills.

The tongue of the poet is always the last to be corrupted.

The fox has no desire for cherries because he has not learned to climb the tree.

Hunting is the image of war.

Any plan is bad that is not susceptible of change.

The dispute which has only one side is easily settled.

A wise man's country is that one where he is happiest.

When the poor give to the rich the devil laughs.

Rogues are rarely poor.

Virtue is feared at court; not loved.

Timidity enthroned is always tyrannical.

The more servants a master has the more enemies he has.

There are many who write good deeds in the dust; and injuries on marble.

A man cannot leave his wisdom or his experience to his heirs.

The sword kills many, but wine more.

Oil and truth will get uppermost at last.

Six feet under earth makes us all of one size.

A man was hanged for saying what was true.

The common soldier's blood makes the general great.

Little conscience and great diligence make a rich man.

A wise man knows no more to any purpose than he practices.

Go early to market and as late as you can to battle.

He who is lucky passes for a wise man, too.

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

SELECTED

On "Radicalism in the Churches"

I observe that some good people are being much agitated by the growth of what they call "radicalism in the Churches." 'Twas ever thus! One wonders when this poor race will acquire the due measure of faith and common sense—not to speak of a sense of humor. We should by this time be grown-up enough not to be afraid of a phrase; and in any case we should often be saved from making fools of ourselves if we tried to learn a little history.

The political use of the term "radical" first became common in England shortly after the close of the Napoleonic Wars; and there is a little touch of comedy in the circumstance that it had at the same time a derivative commercial use, to denote the type of white hat worn by the stormy petrel of the period, "Orator" Hunt. The curious student will find that passage of history full of amusement and instruction. He will smile at the mild and harmless proposals which provoked so great consternation among the respectable; and he will perhaps mourn a little that Mr. Palmer had not been coached in the history of that time before he went to the Department of Justice.

But, so far as I know, there was no suspicion of radicalism in the Churches in those days. The radicals were, as a rule, wicked unbelievers—followers of Godwin, Robert Owen and Francis Place—and the Church was the bulwark of the established order. But a generation later, the abomination of desolation had found its way into the holy place. The authors of this enormity were notably Frederick Denison Maurice, Charles Kingsley, Tom Hughes—names that have long ceased to excite the faintest flutter of misgiving in timid Tory breasts. But in their day they were "dangerous radicals," who were undermining both Church and State, and upon whose impious heads was poured the choicest derision and abuse of the ecclesiastical press. Maurice, the head and front of the offending, was ejected from his professorship at Kings College; Kingsley was inhibited from preaching in London by Bishop Blomfield. Slowly indeed, is writ the Bible of the race!

But the trouble goes a good deal farther back than this. For there is radicalism other than economic. There is (for instance) the ethical radicalism of Amos

and John Baptist, and the purely religious radicalism of St. Paul. Indeed, was not Christianity itself a piece of dangerous radicalism in its beginnings? Was it not said of its propagandists that they were wild agitators who were "turning the world upside down"? "These men . . . do exceedingly trouble our city"—the passage is worth recalling—"and teach customs which are not lawful for us to receive, neither to observe, *being Romans.*" I have no doubt that if they had been familiar with our funny modern idiom of statistics, they would have said, *"one hundred per cent Romans."* Perhaps it is also worth adding that the patriotic complainants in the case are said to have brought their charges against Paul and Silas, when they saw *"that the hope of their gains was gone."* And a little later at Ephesus, a certain Demetrius is reported to have greatly stirred his fellow silversmiths (who manufactured images of Diana for the devout). "Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth," he said, "and this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people; saying they be no gods which are made with hands. . . . This our craft is in danger to be set at naught." Evidently things were much worse then than they are now; for Christianity itself was considered to be subversive of sound economic doctrine.

For three hundred years, Christianity was regarded by the Empire as a menace to "Romanism"; and the menace continued until the successful *"coup d'eglise"* of the astute Constantine, who converted the Church into an "asset" of the Empire. But it has been its misfortune ever since to have been the nursery of "dangerous radicals." John Wyclif and John Ball, John Hus and Martin Luther—each in his day and in his way was threatening the institutions of Law and Order. Think also of the trials of the Vatican with its radicals during the last century alone, first with Lamennais and the French Liberals, then with Dollinger and the Old Catholics in Germany, and last with Loisy, Tyrrell and the Modernists. Other Churches have had their heretics also, and their treatment of them is the least edifying passage of their history.

But radicalism at a distance is not the same thing as radicalism near home; the heresy against another man's orthodoxy is a bird of a different color from the heresy against one's own. We can stand applauding persons like St. Paul, John Wyclif and Lamennais because their particular radicalism does not interfere with us. But one wonders when human nature will acquire sense enough to ask itself the question whether the radical of one's own household may not have something to say for himself to which it may be worth our while to lend a patient and discriminating ear.

By and large it may be affirmed beyond any effectual challenge that every considerable advance that mankind has ever made began in the form of what its orthodox contemporaries called a "dangerous radicalism," or by some equivalent label. To the historical student, this is an observation trite and commonplace enough, but nowhere does it yet appear to have reached the average patriot. It is a very real question whether a Church that cannot produce heretics is not dead, for it means that it is a Church in which nobody thinks for himself.

Probably the most villainous of all heresies is the heresy against our pockets; and the anguish of the conservative mind to-day is born of a sense that the prevailing economic discussion threatens the rights of property. If this were all, we could sincerely encourage them not to worry; for the institution of private property rests upon foundations too secure to be shaken by any economic heresy. In the driving storm of the French Revolution it was supposed that the coefficient and check of the "natural right" of liberty was the "natural right" of property; and it is perfectly clear that a definite relation of some kind exists between them, though it is very much open to question whether the relation is that supposed by the political theorists of 1789. It seems to be indispensable to the freedom of the individual that he should own, that is, should exercise direct personal control over, a certain number of things. Personal liberty implies a certain amount of private property and consequently the institution of private property has a necessary place in a free society. Few people will quarrel with this proposition even (I imagine) among Socialists; but it is not the institution of private property that is called in question to-day, but rather certain expansions of it and certain accretions to it the historical origins of which are comparatively modern. In 1888, Lord Acton wrote to Mr. Gladstone that "the skilled artisans of London are hostile to the Church but not to property"; and I believe that to be still substantially true. The questions that are to-day being raised have no reference to the institution of private property as such, but to the legitimate extent to which property may be held, to the conditions under which it is held and used, and to the processes by which it is acquired. No observant person will deny that these questions are justified; and it is only the thoughtlessness of conventionally-minded people that fails to discriminate between these questions and a blind assault on the institution of private property. Property has its rights; but it is not one of these rights that one man shall acquire and hold property to the injury or the impoverishment or by the servitude of another. The limits within which property may be held are sharply defined by the common right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," by every man's right to what George Meredith called "a man's full share in what is going on in life."

But what has the Church to do with this? The time has long gone by when the question could be dismissed by saying that the business of the Church is religion, and leaving it at that. The water-tight compartment view of life has vanished; and we are recovering a conception of life as a single whole. To religion, *nihil humanum est alienium* any more, for it understands that its concern is with life. The point that the conservative critics of the advanced social groups within the Church have to grasp is that these groups are the symptoms of a new orientation of the Church as a whole. There is a much larger matter afoot than "radicalism in the Church"; there is a slow but sure insurgence of a new spirit. I have a pretty extensive knowledge of many Churches on both sides of the Atlantic; and I am not speaking without my book when I say that if we take that body of the ministry which sets the pace for the rest, we shall find that by and large the men under forty-five years of age are a different race from the men over that age. There are plenty of exceptions, of course, but the generalization is true as a whole. Again speaking generally, the difference is two-fold: first of all the younger men have generally abandoned the "eschato-

logical" view of salvation, the preaching of what Mr. Bernard Shaw calls "salvationism," and state the idea of salvation in terms of the "Kingdom of God," in terms of a divine order of life realizable here in time; and second there is a strong and steady tendency to de-theologize Jesus and to interpret him with a frank realism in the categories of his own thought rather than in those of Greek speculation. It is a shift (so to speak) from theology to biology. The movement has not made itself articulate in any systematic way, has not indeed gone beyond the beginning of a critique of modern institutions. But it may be said that this principle is two-fold; it turns upon every institution, every dogma, every mode of behavior, public or private, and asks concerning it first: Does this make for the *increase* of life? And second: Does this make for the *unity* of life? But this is no more than a beginning. For out of this new sense of the primacy of life will presently emerge a vision of life under some image of a City of God of men and women living together, doing great things together, the great things of the spirit.

In this new orientation, no institution will escape the test. Already the economic system is under fire. It is seen to make for an increase of things but not of life; it is seen to make for the division and disruption of life; and it therefore stands condemned. And this is the root of the "radicalism in the Churches" which is disturbing the timid. That in their recoil from the palpable failure of capitalism to minister to life as a whole, some men and women fall back on Socialism is not to be wondered at; but the people who fancy that they have located the radicalism of the Churches in these small groups of "doctrinaires," are living in a fool's paradise. These are simply the tentative and premonitory manifestations of a new life in the Churches and of an entirely new attitude to the problems of life.

And now we have the old story over again. Maurice (to go no farther back) was condemned for interfering with *laissez-faire;* and the later awakening of the social consciousness comes under the ban of the economic traditionalist because it challenges and criticizes the processes of modern capitalism. But it will take a mightier broom than a bad name to keep back this tide.

This awakening of the Church is long overdue; but it is most certainly coming. Nor is it coming through the invasion of external influences. It is rather coming through the process (as Rudolf Eucken defined it to me in a letter in the far-off days before the war) of "going back to its own living roots and relating itself in ever-widening circles to the problems of the present." Perhaps the Church is really beginning to be Christian.

The Universalist Leader. —*Tertullian Browne.*

NIGHT.

The night time was asleep and all the world
  Breathed the sweet breath of tranquil dreams.
I felt ashamed to be awake! I saw
  Drop through the stars some golden gleams;
I heard lone silence whisper to herself;
  I saw creep by, still silvery streams,
All shadow marked and dripping. Then I, too,
Became a part of all that seems.

Contemporary Verse. —*Alice B. Spencer.*

THE STUDY TABLE

Can We Make Progress?

SOME NEW BOOKS

Among the many books relative to the work done at Paris, none is more interesting, none more instructive, than Tardieu's "Truth about the Treaty."* It is bolstered, though it needs no bolstering, with an introduction by Clemenceau and a foreword by Col. House. Neither introduction nor foreword amounts to much but in the foreword we are told: "If one would know of those fateful days in Paris when the allies of France had gathered from the ends of the earth to have their reckoning with the Central Powers, it would be well to read 'The Truth about the Treaty,' for here it is told by him who knows." Tardieu more than anyone else voiced the French demands as to what the treaty should contain. His book is admirably written. It has the symmetry, the clearness of presentation, the balance, that we expect in serious French works. It sketches the story of French and German relations as an historical background; it narrates the war briefly but in astonishing detail considering the brevity; it discusses one by one the things that Tardieu thinks must be done to ensure French safety and German impotence for years to come. It presents the proposals that France made, the discussions that ensued, the terms finally reached. The demands of France were largely met; it is perhaps just that they should be. Wisdom was less evident in the decisions, than justice. Tardieu tells the truly splendid part taken by France in the war. He as good as asserts that neither British nor American aid was of much account and that British and French field activities were insignificant. In fact he comes near to stating that France really defeated Germany single-handed, that she was just getting her stride, and that if we had all held off she would have gained her victory unaided. Under these circumstances it must be readily granted that she was entitled to the decisive voice at the peace table. The light thrown by Tardieu upon the Conference and upon the men who participated is brilliant. Clemenceau was the all powerful member. Thoughtful reading of the book will deepen American conviction that we should never again meddle in the affairs of Europe. Many times in the discussion, the demands were squarely opposed to views that we feel are fundamental and to statements that we had most solemnly and publicly given to the world. The serious controversy over the continued occupation of the left bank and the bridgeheads of the Rhine is typical of the methods pursued. After a long discussion, in which danger of a break-up was repeatedly imminent, Wilson and Lloyd George yielded to Clemenceau's ultimatum. Tardieu expresses it thus: "The long debate is over. Despite divergences of opinion, the personal relations between the three men during those forty days never ceased to be sincere, calm, and affectionate. May their fellow-countrymen never forget it." The future will probably show that it was during those forty days that the three nations began to drift apart, that America and England began to leave France in an isolation, which will be increasingly dangerous and which will be hardly compensated by Polish friendship. The attitude of Clemenceau was ever to hold

*"The Truth about the Treaty." André Tardieu. Indianapolis: 1921. The Bobbs-Merrill Co. 8vo, pp. (xv) 473.

all he got and to get all he could. What, in this incident, will rankle in American minds is in Clemenceau's slimness in seizing what was offered as a *substitute,* although at the same time securing as much of his original demand as he had at all expected. It was a case of sharpness that leaves a disagreeable impression. Tardieu does not permit it to be forgotten. He says: "Remember that from the beginning of January to the end of April, the participation of the Allies in the occupation and even occupation itself had been refused us; that as a substitute we had been offered the two Treaties of Guarantee and that at the end of the discussion we had both the treaties and the occupation. We had gone a long way." Indeed they had, and they always went a long way. The quotation we gave above from Col. House is notable in that it specifically mentions that it was the "Allies of France" who had gathered to make the treaty. And as the treaty was made primarily for French interests, it cannot long interest those allies, as nations with their own interests and their own affairs; made chiefly for French vengeance, French reimbursement, French reconstruction, French aggrandizement, it will prove an irksome burden for those allies as they get away from the smoke of battle. Signs of this are already evident. The situation of France is critical. Her relations with England are strained, her relations with Russia are worse, her relations with Italy—an ally who suffered much from the war—are far from friendly. Are not these things due, at least in part, to the feeling we have when we think of Clemenceau and his double trophy? My own personal first deep international feeling was sympathy with France in 1871. I anxiously followed the reports of the Prussian war from day to day. I was overwhelmed by the defeat of France, outraged over the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, humiliated at the harsh terms of peace. Those boyhood impressions have never been forgotten. Through the following fifty years I have watched French progress with pride. But now she seems to have over-reached herself; Tardieu's masterly story, more interesting than any novel convinces us of the fact. At the peace table France was supreme. Is she taking part in world-councils today or is she left merely to squabble with Germany? Sidney Osborn's "New Japanese Peril" is not a great book, but the fact that he sees the solution of what he considers a world-problem in an alliance between the United States, Great Britain, Germany and Russia is significant. Has France truly dropped out of the list of powers because she can see only Germany?

Few books of the year have made the stir of "The Mirrors of Downing Street."† The author, "the gentleman with a duster," tell us that his "duster is honest cotton: the hand that holds it is at least clean; and the energy of the rubbing is inspired solely by the hope that such labor may be of some benefit" to his country. He proceeds then to dust off the gentlemen who were conspicuous in England in connection with the war. For one with a duster he is on terms of more intimate equality with his figures than might be expected. Fourteen are his pieces, ranging from Lloyd George to Lord Leverhulme—through politicians, military and naval officers and officials, and business men in administrative positions. The popularity of the book seems largely due to an apparently bitter weighing of Lloyd George and a severe judgment of Lord Kitchener. The deterioration of Lloyd George from the days of high impulse to the present day to day shiftiness is traced. "He is not a bad man to the exclusion of goodness, but he is not a good man to the exclusion of badness." Our author finds the cause of Lloyd George's failure to serve the world as he might have done, in "a vulgarity of mind for which he was not wholly responsible than to any deliberate choice of a cynical partnership with the powers of darkness." As for Lord Kitchener, he was "a second class and even a third class person" viewed in every sense of the word greatness. It is the incisive way in which our janitor insists that his figures in the political and military world fail to measure up to a legitimately demanded standard, that has carried his book to popularity. His knocking of the great and repeatedly great has seemed daring and has therefore given delight. There are exceptions: thus, for Baron Fisher, he has almost unqualified admiration. The last men in his list are those of whom we most desire to learn, as less known. They are business men, whose great works of administration are mentioned in terms of unstinted praise. The contrast in his treatment of these and the others is marked. Does it suggest that he himself is a man of business and only a critical spectator of politics and war? The book is a good one to fill an idle hour. It will make no permanent impression. Aside from a few passages, with punch and sting in them, there is little that will call for reference after a single reading. It is not, however, a bad idea to bring together a series of judgments of these actors in a single book, and the excellent portraits that accompany the sketches are interesting.

Prof. Conklin needs to introduction. His books are regularly, as this one,** made up of a series of lectures, given before respectable, orthodox, conservative audiences, upon some piously-endowed foundation. The series now before us, was given "under the terms of the John Calvin McNair Lectureship on the mutual bearings of science and religion upon each other" at the University of North Carolina. The book falls into three sections—Paths and Possibilities of Human Evolution, Evolution and Democracy, Evolution and Religion. So far as physical and intellectual evolution are concerned Conklin believes that man has reached the probable, or even possible, limit; in the direction of social evolution, he sees vast possibilities. He now passes, naturally enough, to the subject of democracy and looks for this social evolution, in the direction of democracy. In his third division he asserts that there is not and can not be any conflict between science and religion, though there may be—and often has been—conflict between science and theology. Science and religion occupy different fields which should not overlap. Science is a matter of intellect: religion is a matter of emotion. Man will never evolve beyond the need of religion but the eventual religion will be a "progress through struggle like any other evolution and will be ethnocentric rather than egocentric."

Somewhat in the same line as Conklin's book is Thomson's "The Control of Life."‡ It is said to be "a vindication of the thesis that science is for life."

†"The Mirrors of Downing Street." A Gentleman with a Duster. New York and London: 1921. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 8vo, pp. xi, 171.

**"The Direction of Human Evolution." Edwin Grant Conklin. New York: 1921. Charles Scribners Sons. 16mo, pp. xiii, 247.

‡"The Control of Life." J. Arthur Thomson. New York: 1921. Henry Holt & Co. 16mo, pp. viii, 311.

THE FIELD.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE FRIDAY MORNING FORUM

The Educational Section announces the opening of the Abraham Lincoln Centre Friday morning Forum on October 7. At the meetings of the Forum it is proposed to study under expert leaders vital questions of universal interest.

The following speakers have already been secured:

October 7—Prof. Harry F. Ward will speak on "New Motives in Industry."

October 14—Prof. Frederick Starr, "Is Buddhism Alive?"

October 21—Prof. Frederick Starr, "The Omoto-Kyo."

October 28—Scott Nearing, "The New World."

November 4—Prof. Robert E. Park, "Negro Race Consciousness as Reflected in Negro Literature."

November 11—Prof. Robert E. Park, "The Jewish Radicals and the Yiddish Press."

November 18—Bishop Charles D. Williams, "Labor Movements in England."

December 2—Prof. Robert E. Park, "Public Opinion, Prejudice and Race Riots."

December 9—Prof. Robert E. Park, "The Jewish Community in New York and Its Problems."

December 16—Lecture Recital by Carl Sandburg at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Warren McArthur, 4852 Kenwood Avenue.

There will be no meetings during the holidays. After January 1 we expect to have the pleasure of hearing, among others, Algernon S. Crapsey, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Norman Thomas, John Herman Randall, Julia Lathrop, Robert Herrick, John Lovejoy Elliott, James Weldon Johnson, Edward T. Devine, Francis Neilson, Edward A. Steiner, Jane Addams and Mary McDowell. Early in December definite announcement will be made.

Membership tickets covering the entire season, to end of April, $5. Single admission, 50 cents.

HELEN ROSENFELS,
Chairman, Educational Section.

BRITAIN'S MOST SACRED OBLIGATION.

About seventy thousand Armenian women and girls, and a very large number of Armenian children are today held in slavery in Turkish harems and Turkish homes. These Christian women, girls and children are not only subjected to the most revolting degradations and bitter miseries, but they are also forcibly Islamized.

In 1878 but for British interference Armenia and the Armenians would have passed under Russian control. The best successes of the Russo-Turkish war of 1876-77 had been won by Armenian generals in the Russian armies and the Turks were prostrate at the feet of Russia, whose army then stood at the gates of Constantinople. But Britain interfered and saved the Turks from the doom that awaited them. She called the Congress of Berlin and thrust Armenia and the Armenians back under the Turkish yoke.

Bulgaria and the Bulgarians were liberated but Armenia and the Armenians were left to perish.

Had Armenia passed under Russian control in 1878 these Armenian women and children held now in vilest slavery would not be in their present lamentable position, because of the fact that they would not have been under Turkish domination.

To have passed under Russian control in 1878 would have meant for the Armenians passing from Turkish into Russian slavery, but how different would have been the fate of the Armenian people is best illustrated by conditions in Georgia and the position of the Georgian people in comparison to the Armenians.

In the first place Armenia being solely under Russian control the Russian government would not have been able as in past years to utilize the Turkish government and the Turkish populace as instruments for the extermination of the Armenians.

All the Turkish massacres of Armenians have been organized and assisted by European governments, now one government and then another.

The Armenians being left under Turkish domination gave the Russian and the German governments and lately the French government opportunities for organizing and secretly assisting in that kind of massacre of which only the Turks can be capable.

The Armenians who were Russian subjects suffered severely under the autocratic regime of Russia, but so also did the Georgians, in fact the Georgians had even lost their national church which

DUTY TO CIVILIZATION

A Pamphlet answering many questions as to the causes of the Great War, written by FRANCIS NEILSON, author of "How Diplomats Make War," etc., Editor of THE FREEMAN and Associate Editor of UNITY.

This pamphlet will appeal to all those who believe the true history of the war and its causes is yet to be written, and that it is essential to the best development of our civilization.

Published by the
UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
Price, 30 Cents 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO
Reprinted from UNITY

It aims to show how science makes for progress, for amelioration. If there is to be a further, advancing, evolution of man, it must come through the application of science to daily affairs, continuously and in every relation. Those factors in life must be considered in any real control—nature, nurture, function. The significance of each is studied. Both Thomson and Conklin react against the momentary emphasis, common among sociologists and reformers, upon nurture. The fact that heredity may have been unduly stressed in the past is no reason why we should deny its existence. It after all gives the material with which we build and determines absolutely what is possible in the way of a construction. Thomson takes a hopeful view. He believes that achievement lies ahead, that we tend towards realizing the True, the Good, and the Beautiful. Through the study of our selves and our surroundings and the intentional application of natural laws, we shall make advancement. In fact, he indicates the methods and direction of that social evolution to which Conklin refers.

How should a book of lecture-sermons come to our table? We think the publishers ment to send us Chung's "Case of Korea"! But we read all that comes and try to do our duty. "The Drama of the Face"§ has run to a second edition, so it appears to meet a need. The essays are called "studies in applied psychology." They are well worded, and contain much good thought. We are more than ever impressed by the preacher's dependence upon stories and illustrations. They abound, but the pertinence of the resultant moral is not always evident. The *Western Christan Advocate,* in speaking of the book, says: "Here are five sentences. 'There is a story in every face. At fifteen it is the one God has given. At fifty it is the one a man has made for himself. A young man's face is a prophecy, an old man's is a history. A young man's face is a theory—a dream of the future; an old man's face is a fact about himself.' Something worth while? Certainly. The rest of the book is just as enticing." The *Advocate* knows such things better than we do; so we pass their word along.

FREDERICK STARR.

§"The Drama of the Face." Elwin Lincoln House. New York: 1919. Fleming H. Revel Co. 16mo, pp. 258.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

the Russian government had succeeded in effacing, but the Armenians by sturdy and steadfast resistance to the Russian imperialism had been able to preserve the national church of Armenia.

When the war of 1914 began, the Georgians were surprised at the attitude of the Armenians, and expected that the Armenians even as themselves would be glad to be rid of the Russian servitude. The Georgians being under Russian domination only were free to act as their impulses dictated. No part of Georgia was under Turkish domination, thus they could compromise with the Germans and preserve their own existence. But the Armenians could not compromise with the Germans since the largest portion of Armenia was under the Turkish yoke and they (the Germans) had made an enemy of themselves for the Armenians by joining the Turks and secretly encouraging the Turks to exterminate those of their own race who were under Turkish domination.

Thus began for the Armenians the most terrible tragedy in the history of the nation. They fought against the Turk with Russia stabbing them in the back.

The greatest service rendered to France in the war was rendered by an Armenian.

The strong offensive taken by General Samsonoff of the Russian army in August, 1914, compelled Germany to concentrate all her strength on the eastern front; thus the German attack on the western front was weakened and Paris saved. Owing to the treacheries and betrayals to the enemy which honeycombed the entire Russian military staff, General Samsonoff's offensive begun with amazing successes ended in a defeat in which his precious and gallant life was lost. General Samsonoff was an Armenian and although balked of his original purpose of entering into Berlin, nevertheless by his action the capital of France was practically saved from German invasion at the time. But for General Samsonoff's great offensive in August, 1914, there may have been no chance left to the French for a battle of the Marne.

In Cilicia the French have throughout shown the most treacherous enmity toward the Armenians; imitating the old Russian policy of secret encouragement to the Turks.

Nearly three years have passed since the signing of the armistice and the British government has remained oblivious to their most sacred obligation to release the Armenian women and children at present enslaved in a slavery the most abhorrent and cruel and reinstate them in Christian homes.

DIANA AGABEG APCAR.
Yokohama, Japan.

THOMAS STARR KING

PATRIOT AND PREACHER

By CHARLES W. WENDTE

The "Life and Letters" of this distinguished Unitarian hero who gave his life for the Union cause. Written by one who was personally acquainted with Starr King, and who was stirred by the eloquence of this great orator.

The State Legislature of California has recently voted to place a marble statue of Starr King in the National Hall of Fame in Washington as one of the two representative heroes of Californian History.

5 Illustrations. 8vo. 344 pages. $3.00 net. $3.25 by mail.

At All Booksellers, or from

THE BEACON PRESS 25 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.

BOOKSHOP LOCATED AT 16 BEACON STREET